



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 427,699	10/27/1999	MING ZHAO	312762001800	3632

7590 02/11/2002

CAROLYN A FAVORITO
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
3811 VALLEY CENTRE DRIVE
SUITE 500
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2332

EXAMINER

CHEN, SHIN LIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1632	

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/427,699	Applicant(s) Zhao et al.	
	Examiner Shin-Lin Chen	Art Unit 1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED Jan 9, 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____ Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.

3. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);

(b) they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);

(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

4. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):

5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).

6. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) Request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Although the assignee of the patent 5,753,263 and the present application are the same, the inventive entity is not the same (only Lingna Li is common inventor). The inventive entities of the present application and the issued patent

7. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

8. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
Claim(s) allowed: None
Claim(s) objected to: None
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5 and 7-12

9. The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ a) has b) has not been approved by the Examiner.

10. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

11. Other: _____

Art Unit: 1633

DETAILED ACTION

Continued from Advisory Action:

US 5,753,263 ('263) are different and the difference in inventive entity constitutes the prior art, i.e. '263, is an invention by another. The adding of Lingna Li as an inventor of the present application does not overcome the 102(e) and 103(a) rejections.

The issue of priority under 35 U.S.C. 102(g) and possibly 35 U.S.C. 102(f) of the invention must be resolved.

Since the Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302), the assignee is required to state which entity is the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. A terminal disclaimer has no effect in this situation since the basis for refusing more than one patent is priority of invention under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and not an extension of monopoly.

Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of this application.

The rejection under 102(g) or 102(f) is not overcome by addition of Lingna Li as inventor. The assignee still has not provide a statement to explain why the two inventors other than Lingna Li of the present application are not the inventors in the issued patent '263 and why Valeryi Lishko is not an inventor in the present application.

Art Unit: 1633

1. In view of the papers filed 1-9-02, it has been found that this nonprovisional application, as filed, through error and without deceptive intent, improperly set forth the inventorship, and accordingly, this application has been corrected in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(a). The inventorship of this application has been changed by adding Lingna Li as an inventor of the present application.

The application will be forwarded to the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) for issuance of a corrected filing receipt, and correction of the file jacket and PTO PALM data to reflect the inventorship as corrected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Lin Chen whose telephone number is (703) 305-1678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Priebe can be reached on (703) 308-7310. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-4242.

Questions of formal matters can be directed to the patent analyst, Patsy Zimmerman, whose telephone number is (703) 305-2758.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Scott D. Priebe
SCOTT D. PRIEBE
PRIMARY EXAMINER